

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 28, 2000 with claims 1-44. Claims 1-14, 16-22 and 24-44 remain pending. Claims 1, 7, 14, 22, 27, 33 and 39-44 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated December 29, 2005, the Examiner: (I) rejected claims 39-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,870 to Finseth et al. (hereinafter “Finseth”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,880 to Naimpally (hereinafter “Naimpally”); (ii) rejected claims 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 to Shoff et al. (hereinafter “Shoff”) and Naimpally; (iii) rejected claims 1-4, 6, 27-30, 32, 33-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,367,078 to Lasky (hereinafter “Lasky”) and Naimpally; (iv) rejected claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of Shoff, Lasky and Naimpally; (v) rejected claims 5, 31 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of Lasky, Naimpally and U.S. Patent No. 6,005,597 to Barrett et al. (hereinafter “Barrett”); (vi) rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of Shoff, Lasky, Naimpally and U.S. Patent No. 6,714,722 to Tsukidate (hereinafter “Tsukidate”); (vii) rejected claims 18 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of Shoff, Naimpally and Tsukidate; and (viii) rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finseth in view of Shoff, Lasky, Naimpally and U.S. Patent No. 6,732,369 to Schein et al. (hereinafter “Schein”).

With regard to the rejections of claims 1-14, 16-22 and 24-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a), independent claims 1, 7, 14, 22, 27, 33 and 39-44 have been amended to further clarify the selection of the program classification category of the program being viewed. More specifically, independent claims 1, 7, 14, 22, 27, 33 and 39-44 have been amended to recite that the program classification category of the program being viewed is selected by the system from a plurality of classification categories for the program being viewed independent of viewer input, as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at: page 8, lines 3-7; page 9, lines 5-16; and page 13, lines 14-21.

As admitted by the Examiner, Finseth fails to disclose hyperlinking from a program being viewed to a related program, and thus, additionally fails to disclose any manner of selecting a related program. While Lasky discloses surfing related programs, Naimpally discloses filtering an electronic programming guide, and Barrett monitors a viewer's program choices, the cited references taken either separately or in combination fail to disclose that the selection of a related program is made by the system based on both the television viewing habits of the viewer and a program classification category selected by the system from a plurality of classification categories for the program being viewed independent of viewer input. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1-14, 16-22 and 24-44 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 17-22, 25-31, 33-37 and 39-44 have also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for and maintain consistency between the elements of the claims. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-14, 16-22 and 24-44 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: March 29, 2006